ಶ್ರೀ ಆಲೂರು ಹನುಮಂತಪ್ಪ.—ಒಟ್ಟು ಅಷ್ಟು ಖರ್ಚಾಗಿದೆ, ಇನ್ನುಮುಂದೆ ವಿಳಂಬವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಭರವಸೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ರೇವಣಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ.—ತಳಪಾಯ ತೆಗೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಕಲ್ಲು ವಗೈರೆ ಇರುವುದು ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುವುದಿಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಬೋರ್‌ವೆಲ್ ಮಿಷೀನಿನ ಮೂಲಕ ಟೆಸ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಅಂದಾಜು ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೇ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಆಲೂರು ಹನುಮಂತಪ್ಪ.—1,200 ಅಡಿ ಜಾಗಕ್ಕೆರ್ಲಾ ಬೋರ್‌ವೆಲ್ ಮೇಷೀನ್ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಮಿತಿಮೀರಿದಾಗ ಫೌಂಡೇಷನ್ ಬದಲಾಯಿಸಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—I did not get a reply to my question Sir. Is it not a fact that more than 75 per cent of this 8 lakhs has gone towards establishment charges.

Sri ALUR HANUMANTHAPPA —It is not correct Sir. The same Executive Engineer, Hassan Division, will look after entaire work. There may be one Assistant Engineer and attached to him his staff.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬ್ಯೈರಪ್ಪಾಜಿ.—31 ವರ್ಷ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಈ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಇದನ್ನು ಕ್ಯೆಬಿಡುವುದು ಉತ್ತಮವಲ್ಲವೇ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಆಲೂರು ಹನುಮಂತಪ್ಪ.—ಪ್ರಾರಂಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಷ್ಟ ಬಂದರೆ ಹೀಗಾಗುವುದೇ ವಿನಾ ಎಲ್ಲ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ಹೀಗಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಲೈನ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಥೇಂಜ್‌ಮಾಡಿ ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪರ್ಟ್ ಒಪೀನಿಯನ್ ಪಡೆಯಲು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ತಡವಾಯಿತು, ಮುಂದೆ ಹೀಗಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬ ನಂಬಿಕೆ ಇದೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Question Hour is over.

2-00 P.M.

MESSAGE FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Announcement.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now I report to the House that messages have been received from the Legislative Council that the following Bills passed by the Legislative Assembly during the last and current sittings of the First Session 1965 and transmitted to the Legislative Council have been passed by the Legislative Council without any amendment.

(*a*) The Mysore Labour Welfare Fund Bill, 1964.
(*b*) The Mysore Tenancy Laws (Amendment) Bill 1965.

Motion *Re*: Action of Sri S. Gopala Gowda in forcibly Dragging an Official of Legislature Secretariat into the House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now, Hon'ble Memebers are all aware what happeu on last Saturday. The Hon'ble Member Sri S. Gopala Gowda came and met me in my chambers and made a request that I should take this up immediately after Question Hour. Even without his asking. that was natural course that I could and should follow. I wanted to take it up and I told him that Iproposed to take it up immediately after the Question Hour. I do not see the Hon'ble Member Sri S. Gopala Gowda in the House ?

(Sri S. Gopala Gowda entered the House at this Stage)

Now that the Hon'ble Member is here, I wish to tell the House that I have ascertained further particulars of which I could not have been possibly aware because I was on the dias, that is, the version that is to be gathered from the Officer of the House who was handled or treated in the manner that was done by this Hon'ble Member Sri Gopala Gowda. I was also desirous to know what exactly happened outside the House in the lobby when the slip was sent by me for his perusal and return. I am in possession of all the relative matters pertaining to the same.

There are two important matters, each distinct from the other, each of which arise for the consideration of the House independently, dissociated from the other.

First is, with regard to the officer of the House in discharging his duties while on duty and going out was brought back before the House I do not know whether I should say 'man handled' by compulsion against his will. When he did not want to come, he was bodily touched roughly and his coat or shirt or bush shirt was caught hold of and he was dragged into the House. Then, at that time, as I observed the other day, it is something which I have not witnessed elsewhere or such event has happned elsewhere. Every person has got his sense of self-respect. Officers in the Service of the House and the staff have got their own sense of self-respect. They are entitled to have that. And if there is anything that goes wrong, it is the duty of the House to see that such things do not happen, and if they happen, how they should be evaluated; whether they should be held as correct or incorrect.

Then, when the Hon'ble Member was asked, he gave his version. His version was that, when he was called out by this particular official, he want to the Lounge; but, when he heard that it was for the purpose of verifying whether there was any error and what corrections ought to be made in the speach that was recorded, the Hon'ble Member felt that when the Speaker was addressing on a matter of importance that he should not have been called by the particular Reporter and the manner in which it was done was rather an insult or something infringing his dignity and privilege and rights and therefore he felt that he would be justified in asking the Reporter to come back to the House, and when he did not come, the Hon'ble Member was justified in pulling him into the House. I further asked the Hon'ble Member as towhether he wants to say anything with regardto the circumstances of which the Hon. House might not be aware, because before judging upon any question, it is the elementary rule of justice that the personagainst whom anything has to be done or thought of and told upon, should have a chance of explaining. There may be very important circumstances of which the Hon'ble Members of the House or I, as the Speaker, may not be aware. Therefore, I got it ascertained from the Hon'ble Member as to whether he wishes to say anything, what was it

(Mr. Speaker)

that made him to bring that officer into the House like that. If he found that it was a mistake, that it was not open to the officer to call him from the House, even if he felt a doubt of that type, was he justified in dragging the officer into the House and asking the House, why action should not be taken against him ? What he said, the House has heard already.

The position emerges that an Officer of the Legislature Secretariat, that is, a Reporter, who is working in the House has been handled like that. So that the House may know what exactly is the position or the relationship or the duties and responsibilities are and how, if any errors unwittingly or otherwise, creep into the proceedings, how they are to be corrected and what is the procedure that is to be followed.

This is from the Journal of the Parliaments of the Commonwealth ; Parliamentary Reporting on page 116 : The Heading is "Co-operation from Members".

> " Checking, whether it be done by a second reporter or by means of a reporter reading his shorthand notes against a tape recording, takes time, which is an element of overriding importance in the task of producing HANSARD. During the late afternoon the messengers taking the transcript to the printers leave at intervals of 45 minutes, and during the evening at 30 minutes intervals ; the last batch of typescript, *i,e.*, the report of the debate between 10 P.M. and 10-30 P.M. is sent at 11 P.M. within these time-limits, it might be found too time consuming to search the tape for a specific passage, to play it and often to replay several times, in an effort to catch a few words that were originally inaudible ; and at Westminster, if the second listening reporter has not heard those words, the reporter in difficulty promptly sends a note down to the Member asking him to supply them."

So, if the Reporter wantsthis so that the recorded matter may be correct, it is not wrong in seeking the co-operation of the Members.

> "Co-operation from Members is essential if Hansard is to be produced accurately and rapidly and at Westminster that co-operation is given promptly and sympathetically.
>
> " There are three ways in which Members are asked to assist :
>
> 1. A note may be sent down to the Member by the reporter asking him to fill in a blank in a short passage or to verify its accuracy—"The Official Reporter would be obliged if Mr..... would....." the printed slips read ; and the Editor's instruction to the reporters is to complete the slip politely and tersely, without comment. He is at liberty to send a note and the member cannot take it amiss. If he does it he does so in the discharge of his duties. If he does it, he does it in the interest of the member who's speech is under consideration.

"(2) In all cases where there are several queries running through a speech—*e.g.* a member may mention many place-names, or one of the overseas territories and refer to tribal names—the Member may be asked to send up his notes if he was obviously making his speech by reference to notes, or to come to the office to look through the typescript report of the speech."

So, what is stated is to go to the office to look through the transcript report of speech.
Further, it is stated:

(3) "It is permissible for a Member if he so wishes, to come to the Editor's room to check the accuracy of the typescript report, provided that he does so at the appropriate time the typescript cannot be delayed, but must go to the printers at the appointed time."

Here also the time is fixed. So it can be seen that, if the Reporter has asked for any information, I cannot easily come to a conclusion that he was doing any thing that was wrong. Even if there was any error as thought of by the Hon'ble Member, I wanted him to tell us how he could handle him like that I do not think any satisfactory explanation has been given. An officer is entitled to be protected. In fact, it crossed my mind: Suppose the Reporter instead of coming and allowing himself to be dragged retaliated, it would be a most embarrassing position for the House to entertain and witness a sort of qurarel and man-handling by one or the other. In the explanation that I have got, the Reporter says: "I was dumb-struck; I become highly nervous." Whatever it is, the Reporter did not do anything for which he could be held blameworthy. On the other hand, I would very much say that what he has done is within the limits and is proper and he can certainly expect a word of appreciation for not placing the House and the Members in any embarrassing position to a greater degree.

Now, this particular act has nothing to do with the other incident relating to the slip that was sent and the treatment that the slip received or at the hands of the Hon'ble Member. So far as this particular incident is concerned, the manner of his doing it is a very serious affair and I have no doubt that it is contempt of the House. It is a House that has assembled here and the House had to helplessly witness something which was never expected at any time to happen on the Floor of the House. This happening is something which has made me very sad. Can we not set better standards of conduct for ourselves? We must try to see that nobody thinks of himself either individually or collectively in any manner other than with the highest respect. None of us can think that we do not do it and that one member does it. He is one of us If. he is not one of us, we need not have thought about it. If he had done it elsewhere, I would not in the least have minded it, because the parties would pursue their rights elsewhere. But when it happens on

(Mr. SPEAKER)

the floor of the House and with regard to a person in service in the discharge of his duties and further if it is to be thought that this is something which is justified, I for one cannot at all agree that it is in any way praiseworthy. The Hon'ble Member came and wanted me to give an opportunity. If he wants to say anything, I do not want to deny him an opportunity. I have made my position very clear. I suppose the House feels with me that it is something which no Member of the House supports to any extent whatsoever. Dragging an Officer of the House by the collar as if he is an animal such as a dog, is something which even now I cannot think of and that happened on the floor of the House. Is there any Member who supports that kind of conduct? I suppose no one will support it.

HON'BLE MEMBERS.—No.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Does the Hon'ble Member want to say anything?

†ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡ (ತೀರ್ಥಹಳ್ಳಿ).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಶನಿವಾರ ನಡೆದ 2 ಘಟನೆಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತಾವು ತಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—On only one I have given and on the other I have not.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ನಾನು ಹಿಂದೆ ಅವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿ ಕೊಂಡು ಈ ಘಟನೆಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾನು ವಿವರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ತಾವು ಏನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಆ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಎರಡು ಘಟನೆಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನನ್ನ ಭಾವನೆ ಏನು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ತಮ್ಮ ಹಾಗೂ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಆಶಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನನ್ನ ಪ್ರಚೋದನೆ ಏನೇ ಇರಲಿ ನಾನು ಈ ಸದನದ ವರದಿಗಾರರೊಬ್ಬರನ್ನು ಬಲಾತ್ಕಾರವಾಗಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯೊಳಗೆ ಕರೆತಂದು ತಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ ರೀತಿ ಮತ್ತು ಆ ವರ್ತನೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾನು ವಿಷಾದಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅದು ಯಾವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದಲೂ ಉಚಿತವಾದ ವರ್ತನೆಯಾಗಿರಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನನಗೆ ಖಚಿತವಾಗಿ ಗೊತ್ತಾಯಿತು. ಇನ್ನೊಂದು, ಚೀಟಿ ಹರಿದುದು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—We will deal with it later on.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡ.—ಈ ಸಂಬಂಧದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಯಾವ ವರದಿಗಾರನನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯೊಳಗೆ ಬರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಬಲಾತ್ಕರಿಸಿದೆನೋ ಮೈಯಕ್ತಿಕವಾಗಿ ಅವರ ಕ್ಷಮಾಪಣೆಯನ್ನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆ ಒಂದು ಘಟನೆಯಿಂದ ತಮಗೂ ಹಾಗೂ ಈ ಸದನಕ್ಕೂ ನೋವು ಆಗಿದ್ದ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಅಸಮಾಧಾನವಾಗಿದ್ದ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಕ್ಷಮಾಪಣೆಯನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ಕೇಳಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ (ನಗರಾಡಳಿತ ಶಾಖೆಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು).—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ನಾನು ತಮಗೆ ಪತ್ರ ಬರೆದು ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆಯನ್ನು ಬೇಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ತಮ್ಮ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಪಡೆದು ಅದನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಗಾಗಿ ಇಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಬೇಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನನ್ನ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಇದೆ :

> "That as the action of the Hon'ble Member, Sri S. Gopala Gowda on Saturday, the 6th instant, in forcibly dragging an Officer of the Legislature Secretariat by his shirt into the House while the House was sitting amounts to a serious contempt of the House committed in the view of the House, this House resolves that the Hon'ble Member be suspended from service of the House for the rest of the current sessions."

MR. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

"That as the action of the Hon'ble Member Sri S. Gopala Gowda on Saturday, the 6th instant, in forcibly dragging an Officer of the Legislature Secretariat by his shirt into the House while the House was sitting amounts to a serious contempt of the House committed in the view of the House, this House resolves that the Hon'ble Member be suspended from service of the House for the rest of the current sessions."

I propose to put it to the House.

SRI R. N. LAKSHMIPATHI (Gauribidanur).—Sir, before the resolution is put to the House, I would like to say that Sri S. Gopala Gowda has expressed his regret and apologies to the person to whom..... ...

MR. SPEAKER.—If the Hon'ble Member wants to say anything, let him ask for my permission.

SRI R. N. LAKSHMIPATHI.—Sir, what I want to say is that before it is finally put to vote, we may consider what Sri S. Gopala Gowda has said.

MR. SPEAKER.—Who is to consider ? Has the Member read the Rules ? If he does not even choose to read the rules and want to Debate...I am really unable to understand that. If he wants permission to do that, let him state under what rule he wants it.

SRI R. N. LAKSHMIPATHI.—I thought you could finally settle the issue by taking the consensus of opinion of the House before putting the motion to vote. If you put the motion of Sri K. Puttaswamy to vote and if it is adopted the next step would automatically follow.

MR. SPEAKER.—I am going to put it to vote. How can I know the opinion of the House without putting it to vote ?

SRI R. N. LAKSHMIPATHI.—In view of the apology tendered by Sri S. Gopala Gowda let us reconsider.

MR. SPEAKER.—Reconsider what ? The apology ? Members must understand that on motions like this Debate is not allowed. If he wants to say anything I might permit, but not under the Rules because I do not want anything to happen under the Rules. Suppose I permit one Member to say something, then is not every member entitled to speak and then all the 208 members would like to say something !

SRI V. M. DEO (Gubbi).—The question is whether punishment of this nature is necessary for this kind of thing and whether we cannot take any other action in the circumstances.

MR. SPEAKER.— Will the Hon'ble Member tell me under what rule am I to reject the motion ?

SRI V. M. DEO.—There is a proven irregularity here in whatever has happened. It is up to the Chair to take whatever action it feels to take.

MR. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member is putting in me powers which I do not possess.

Sri V. M. DEO.—You do possess because a similar incident happened somewhere. There are now two courses open to you.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Where did it happen ?

Sri V. M. DEO.—There was a privilege issue regarding the Crossword Puzzle and something and something.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Without clear ideas the Hon'ble Member must not embarrass the House.

Sri S. SIVAPPA (Sravanabelagola).—There are two issues before the House. One is that after the whole thing the other day, after introspection the Member has come out with an open apology for the action he has done. Then there is another motion by the Hon'ble Minister for suspending the Member for the current session. This is a drastic measure.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ವಿ. ಗೌಡ (ಪಾಳ್ಯ).—ತಪ್ಪು ಮಾಡಿರುವವರು ತಮ್ಮ ತಪ್ಪನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಕ್ಷಮಾಪಣೆಯನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಮೊದಲು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಬೇಕು.

(Sri Venkatagiriyappa rose)

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is Sri P. Venkatagiriyappa debating ? Let me understand the position ?

Sri P. VENKATAGIRIYAPPA (Kolar).—I am not debating. I want to give only one explanation. It is possible that the Hon'ble Minister might have sent his motion to you earlier to Sri S. Gopala Gowda apologising to the House....

Mr. SPEAKER.—What is it that the Hon'ble Member is trying to develop. Does the Hon'ble Member mean that the Hon'ble Minister should have given notice of this motion to the Hon'ble Member before bringing it to the House ? That kind of argument will not be allowed. At best the question may be, since he has apologised whether this action is necessray or not.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—That is the thing, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—But the Hon'ble Member is asking whether the Minister should not have given notice of his motion to the Hon'ble Member in which case he would or would not have apologise l.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—What he meant was...

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do not know what he means in his mind. I understand only what he says.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—In view of the unconditional apology tendered by the Hon'ble Member it is open to the Hon'ble Minister to withdraw his motion. That is what he meant.

Mr. SPEAKER.—But he said that notice of the motion should have been sent to the Member and all that.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—That was never his intention to say.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If the Hon'ble Member wants to make an appeal to the mover of the motion, I have no objection.

Sri H. R. KESHAVA MURTHY (Gandasi).—I request the Hon'ble Minister to withdraw the motion.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಮ್ಮ ಈ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಮಾರು 80 ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಗೂ ಮೇಲ್ಪಟ್ಟು ಪ್ರಜಾ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿ ಸಭೆ ಮತ್ತು ವಿಧಾನ ಸಭೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳು, ನಡವಳಿಕೆಗಳು

ನಡೆದದ್ದರಲ್ಲಿ ಇಂಥಾ ಘಟನೆ ಯಾವೊತ್ತೂ ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಯಾವ ಶರತ್ತೂ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಬೇಶರತ್ತಾಗಿ ಕ್ಷಮಾಪಣೆಯನ್ನು, ಕೇಳಿದ್ದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಅದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಬಿಡುವುದು ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟದ್ದು. ನಾನೂ ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡರು ಮಾಡಿದಂತಹ ಅಪರಾಧ ಬಹಳ ದೊಡ್ಡದಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ಕ್ಷಮಾಪಣೆಯನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿ ನಾನು ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ವಾಪಸು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯವರು ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯದ ಮೇರೆ ತಮ್ಮ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ವಿನಂತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ಘಟನಾವಳಿಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡರನ್ನು ಈ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದ ಕೊನೆಯವರೆಗೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಿಂದ ಸಸ್ಪೆಂಡ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಸರಿ ಎಂದು ಯಾರೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹುಶಃ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಇತಿಹಾಸದಲ್ಲೇನಡೆಯದೇ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಒಂದು ಘಟನೆ ನಡೆದಿದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಕೂಡ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಅವರು ಮಾಡಿದಂತಹ ತಪ್ಪನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡು ಯಾವ ಶರತ್ತೂ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಬೇಷರತ್ತಾಗಿ ಕ್ಷಮಾಪಣೆಯನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ವಿಶದವಾಗಿ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಕೆಡಿಸಿರುವ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮರ್ಯಾದೆಯನ್ನು ಎತ್ತಿ ಹಿಡಿಯುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಶಿಕ್ಷೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ. ತಪ್ಪು ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಏನು ಶಿಕ್ಷೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು, ಶಿಕ್ಷೆಯ ಅವಧಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಮತ್ತು ಆ ಶಿಕ್ಷೆಯ ಗಾತ್ರ, ಪ್ರಮಾಣ ಎಷ್ಟಿರಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದು ಮುಖ್ಯ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಮನುಷ್ಯ ತನ್ನ ತಪ್ಪನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಕ್ಷಮಾಪಣೆಯನ್ನು ಬೇಡುವುದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನದು ಬೇರೆ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅವರು ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಬಂದು ತಮ್ಮ ತಪ್ಪನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡು, ತಮ್ಮ ಕ್ಷಮಾಪಣೆಯನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದು ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಕೂಡ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ದೊಡ್ಡ ವಿಚಾರ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಭಾವನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಸದಸ್ಯರು ತಪ್ಪು ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡು ಆ ತಪ್ಪಿಗಾಗಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಕ್ಷಮಾಪಣೆಯನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ನಮ್ಮ ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡಸ್ತಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ತೋರಿಸುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಭಾವನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯ ಗೌರವ ಪ್ರತಿಷ್ಠೆಗಳು, ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಲ್ಲಿ ಕ್ರೋಡೀಕೃತವಾಗಿವೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ತಪ್ಪನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಕ್ಷಮಾಪಣೆಯನ್ನು ಬೇಡಿದರೆ ಶಿಕ್ಷೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಆಯಿತು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅವರ ಕ್ಷಮಾಪಣೆಯನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳೋಣ, ಆದರಿಂದ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮರ್ಯಾದೆಯೂ ಉಳಿಯುತ್ತದೆ, ಅವರಿಗೆ ಶಿಕ್ಷೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಭಾವನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇವನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಿ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ದೇವಯ್ಯ(ಮಂಡ್ಯ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಾನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಗೌರವಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ನಿಂತಿದ್ದೇನೆ ಇದು ಭಾಷಣವಲ್ಲ. ಎರಡೇ ವಿಷಯ. ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ವಿಷಯ ಎಲ್ಲರ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಂತೂ ನೋವು ಬಹಳ ಉಂಟುಮಾಡಿದೆ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೂ ಅನುಮಾನವಿಲ್ಲ. ಯಾವ ಸಭೆಯೊಳಗೆ ಯಾವ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿದರೋ, ಅದೇ ಸಭೆಯೊಳಗೆ ತಾವು ಮಾಡಿದಂಥಾದ್ದು ತಪ್ಪು ಎಂದು ಅವರು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕಿಂತಲೂ ಉನ್ನತವಾದ ವಿಷಯ ಇನ್ನೊಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿಯವರು ಅವರ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ವಾಪಸು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಎಲ್ಲರ ವಿಶ್ವಾಸವನ್ನೂ ಗಳಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ತಮ್ಮ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದಾಗಬಾರದು. ನಾನು ಬಹಳ ಜನ ಸಭಾಪತಿಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಆದರೆ ನಿಮಗೆ ಬಹಳ ತಿಳುವಳಿಕೆ ಇದೆ. ನಮ್ಮೆಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಬಹಳ ತಿಳುವಳಿಕೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ನಾವು ತಪ್ಪು ಮಾಡಿದಾಗ, ಇನ್ನಷ್ಟೂ ತಿಳುವಳಿಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಬುದ್ಧಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಈ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀ ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿಯವರು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದಿಟ್ಟಿರುವ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ವಾಪಸು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತೊಮ್ಮೆ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

2-30 P.M

Mr. SPEAKER.—So far whatever has been said about me is perfectly irrelevant. Therefore let it not influence anybody one way or the other. I will put it to the vote of the House.

(Hon'ble Member Sri R. N. Lakshmipathi, Sri V. M. Deo stood up).

Mr SPEAKER.—I have said that there is no debate on this. cannot permit any more speeches.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Sir, I want to make a distinction between ..

Mr. SPEAKER.—Distinction of what?

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ವಿ. ಗೌಡ.—ಅವರು ಕ್ಷಮಾಪಣೆ ಕೇಳಿಕೊಂಡ ಮೇಲೆ, ಶಿಕ್ಷೆ ವಿಧಿಸುವುದು ಸರಿಯೂ ದುದೂ ಅಲ್ಲ, ನ್ಯಾಯ ಬದ್ಧವಾದುದಲ್ಲ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What the member has stated is less forcible than what Sri S. Sivapa stated.

ಶ್ರೀ ಆರ್. ಎನ್. ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮೀಪತಿ.—ಶ್ರೀ ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿಯವರು ಮನಸ್ಸು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಈ ಹರ್ಷಯನ್ನು ಪೋಸ್ಟ್‌ಪೋನ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If Members do not understand, what can I do? Motions of this type cannot be postponed. ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಡಿಬೇಟ್ ಮುಂದೆ ಹಾಕಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ನನಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿಲ್ಲ. I will put it to the House. The question is:

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಮಾದೇಗೌಡ (ಮಳವಳ್ಳಿ).—ನಾವು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಲಿಲ್ಲ ವಲ್ಲಾ. ಡಿಸಿಶನ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದನ್ನು ಒಂದು ದಿವಸ ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಕಬೇಕು. ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ದಿವಸ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, order. When the Speaker is standing if the Member does not know the elementary rule, I will ask him to retire from the House. Does he not know that when the Speaker is on his legs, no Member should stand up? Or is it simply because I am yielding? Hereafter I will strictly enforce the rule. I will put the motion to the House:

The question is:

> "That as the action of Hon'ble Member Sri S. Gopala Gowda on Saturday the 6th instant in forcibly dragging an officer of the Legislature Secretariat by his shirt into the House while the House was sitting amounts to a serious contempt of the House committed in the view of the House, this House resolves that the Hon'ble Member be suspended from the service of the House for the rest of the current session."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have to request the Hon ble Member to retire from the House.

(The Hon'ble Member Sri S. Gopal Gowda withdrew from the House).

Motion *Re*: The Action of Sri S. Gopal Gowda in Throwing Awayaletter Addressed to the Speaker

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now the other matter is one relating to a letter addressed to me by the Hon'ble Member Smt. Nagaratnamma. I have read the contents. It was addressed to the Chair and not to the Hon'ble Member Sri S. Gopal Gowda. Before I took any action on that I wanted the Hon'ble Member to state his views. I sent it to him with a request to peruse and return It did not come back to me and I had asked the